



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

It was further provided that, while the component parts of the British Empire had their place in the Assembly of the League, the British Empire, still undivided, was to have a seat on the Council of the League. No wonder the United States, in search for objections to the Covenant, fastened upon this extraordinary phenomenon. They impaled us on the horns of this dilemma: Either we were one State, as appeared in the Council of the League, and if we were one State, how could we be six States in the Assembly?

The gist of all this is that, without deliberation, without consulting the people, without any authority or mandate, events have taken place which practically amount to the admission of the five component parts of the Empire to an independent voice in foreign affairs. They have, by joining the League, taken upon themselves obligations which can only be undertaken by States which control their own foreign affairs. But the curious thing is that, while all this has taken place, nobody desires that what is the natural result of this independence should occur, and that amounts to the disruption of the Empire.

This difficulty must be solved in one of two ways: Either there will be real separation, or there must be some machinery devised for securing co-operation and combination in external affairs for which as yet no permanent provision has been made.

WARS OF TOMORROW ARE BOUND TO COME, in the opinion of M. Scelle, professor of International Law at Dijon, France, because

1. A portion of Asiatic Turkey is pregnant with immediate conflict, even among the Allies. Four or five nations are engaged in this struggle.
2. Baltic competition is more bitter than ever.
3. The Saar Valley contains the germs of a conflict for the future.
4. The blaze may break out in the Ruhr at any moment.
5. Patchwork reconstruction of Poland, the Danzig corridor and the isolation of East Prussia are so many wasps' nests of trouble.
6. Silesia is a burning question. Teschen puts Poland and Czechoslovakia in brutal opposition.
7. Jugoslavia cannot achieve her unity.
8. Reactionary Hungary is simply awaiting her hour to spring upon her neighbors.
9. Austria cannot live alone.
10. Bulgaria is sulky and stealthily is plotting revenge.
11. Greater Greece of the Sevres Treaty is an absurd and impossible conception.
12. Rumania is threatened by her neighbors on the Besarabian and Transylvanian flanks.
13. Anglo-American rivalry.
14. Antagonism of the Japanese and Americans in the Pacific.

In addition to these "14 points," the French jurist calls attention to the problem of Soviet Russia and the "drive" of international communism against capitalism and republicanism the world over. He summons his countrymen to better knowledge of foreign politics, fiercer opposition to secret diplomacy, and more common sense and less heroics in dealing with German reparation. For the extreme policy of Foch and Poincaré he has naught but condemnation because of its failure to learn from France's own experience as a vanquished foe.

PHILIPPINE INSULAR RULE creates for the United States a concrete test of its principles; and that test is likely to come soon. With the change of administration in Washington and nomination of a new governor-general, then acceptance or rejection of the Filipino demand for home rule will devolve upon the Republican party, which was in power when the islands were acquired from Spain. President Wilson and Governor-General Harrison have stood for quicker release of the natives from American supervision than their Republican predecessors were prepared to advocate. Concessions made during the Wilson administration have given the natives much that they wanted; and they now seek independence, but with a string to it, namely, permanent American protection, in return for which they will make special concessions to the United States that would be especially advantageous for trade in times of peace and for American success in case of war with Japan. Governor-General Harrison, retiring from office, at a banquet, January 17, indicated that in his opinion the time had come for a Filipino governor-general; and Manuel Quezon, president of the Philippine Senate, said that a referendum would show 98 per cent of the population desiring absolute independence and a constitution of their own framing. Addressing the Senate on January 19, Quezon said:

Let the Americans in the Philippines and those in the United States know that the people of the Philippines covet their freedom, liberty, and political emancipation so much that they will not hesitate to receive from the Congress of the United States complete and absolute independence without protection.

If the United States, dictated by its own interests, decides to extend protection to the Philippines, well and good. We would accept that as a solution of our problem. If not, let us have absolute independence without protection. We want independence in whatever form we can get it.

LETTER BOX

STANFORD UNIVERSITY P. O., CALIF., *January 4, 1921.*

EDITOR ADVOCATE OF PEACE:

I learn from Alfred Schneyder, president of the German Students' Peace League (*Deutscher Pazifistischer Studentenbund*), that the various student groups devoted to opposition to militarism and centralization in Germany are now consolidated in one.

These devoted young men are much in need of financial help for lectures and publications, and like-minded people in the United States ought to aid them. Conferences and pamphlets are cheaper than battleships and more effective. A few thousand dollars spent on strengthening similar organizations from 1908 to 1914 might have saved civilization from wreckage. If Europe is yet to be rescued, young men of abiding principles must do the work, and the rest of us should help.

Before there is a real league of nations, there must be in all countries thousands of men and women in dead earnest in support of the basis on which all durable peace must stand.

Very truly yours,

DAVID STARR JORDAN.

ANDOVER, N. H., *January 11, 1921.*

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ADVOCATE:

In connection with the international correspondence to promote international good will, I have received many touching letters from Germany. About one hundred and thirty

letters have been received from Duisburg alone from children who are fed by the Quakers. I inclose a letter from a little boy. These letters, so spontaneous and so touching, ought to move people to give generously in the big drive conducted by Mr. Hoover. I also send a letter by older students, pathetic in their earnest struggle for reform in spite of great misery and almost utter despair. If any readers of the *Advocate* would be pleased to co-operate with me in this blessed "ministry of reconciliation," I shall be grateful. People of any age can write and letters can be sent in English. I shall be happy to give any further information.

MARY N. CHASE.

Translation

DUISBURG-WANHEIM, November 14, 1920.

MY DEAR AMERICAN FRIEND:

How happy I am to be able to write to you today! Are you truly one of those who have sent us in this school a plate of soup and a whole biscuit? Heartily do I thank you for it! We are always happy over the delicious soup, and every morning we guess what good thing we shall have that day. Before we receive the delicious soup sent by you we are weighed and are soon weighed again. Then we find we have gained.

I live in a suburb of Duisburg, on the Rhine, where, in great factories, steam-engines and iron bridges are made.

My brother Willie and I are twins. We have four sisters. You can easily think that my mother is happy when I get the breakfast in school given by you; also my parents thank you and all most heartily who send us this precious food. May God reward you for the good you have done us.

Your unknown friend greets you most kindly.

(Signed)

HEINI GIESEN,

Duisburg-Wanheim, Friemersheimerstr. 64.

(Copy)

HEPPENHEIM A BERGSTR., December 6, 1920.

DEAR FRIEND:

Last year you sent Christmas greeting to Mr. Stein, Oberrealschule in Heppenheim. Because he doesn't know any English, our master, Professor Weimer, read us your kind and cordial letters and we are glad that there are among young Americans so many noble souls. We thank you very much for your truly human feelings, and we reach you our hands in brotherly community and shake yours with grateful reply.

In spite of all misery, you would see mighty work for self-government in school and public life, in the ideas of true democracy. We follow no other teacher but is considered an authority on account of his great knowledge and moral qualities. We don't want drilling lessons any longer, but self-control, self-discipline, and especially respect for the rights of humanity and internationalism. Unfortunately, we have to bear the disgrace and the consequences of the former system of government, with its principle: Might before right. Broken down as we are, we have put our hearts into the regeneration of our spiritual life, and the students of our Oberrealschule take part in the efforts of education and intellectualization of the working class. We have a reading club and musical evening parties for instruction of workmen. It is very hard work to think of reforms and improvements under the most trying circumstances, beyond the hope of recovery. The head workers suffer more by the want of intellectual than material food. English and French books can't be afforded. Really, the German people are condemned to sink into a state of ignorance, degradation, barbarism, and despair. We feel it every day more and more.

Wishing you a Merry Christmas and a happy New Year,

We are truly,

HERTA WESKOTT AND 17 OTHERS,
Students of the Ib (Lower Sixth Form).

To the Editor of the *Advocate of Peace*:

You are undoubtedly right in saying, as you did in your issue of September-October, that the failure of France and Belgium to file the full text of their "military understand-

ing" of last September constitutes a serious embarrassment to the League of Nations. If the agreement in question were to be withheld indefinitely from the prescribed publicity, it might, to quote your words, be described as "the most serious blow which the League could receive," but I think you have no reason as yet to conclude that the blow already has been struck.

That, at the start of such a novel international venture as the League, differences of opinion should arise as to the proper interpretation of its organic document, seems inevitable. These differences need not prove fatal, however, so long as the authority of the League and the obligations of its members have not been finally repudiated. France and Belgium have made no secret of the fact that they have arrived at an agreement concerning common defense in case of German aggression. Pressed to comply with Article 18 of the Covenant by publication of the text of that agreement, they have filed a series of covering letters indicating the purpose of the agreement, and have at the same time quoted Article 21 of the Covenant as an excuse for withholding the text itself. The article in question says that "nothing in this covenant shall be deemed to affect the validity of international engagements, such as treaties of arbitration or regional understandings like the Monroe Doctrine, for securing the maintenance of peace."

This claim constitutes a logical moot point, on which the League, represented by the General Secretariat, has taken a view diametrically opposed to that of the powers involved. Thus the case stands today, but there are many indications that it will be pressed until the spirit of the Covenant is fulfilled. Any member of the League can bring it before the Assembly or the Council, under Article 11 of the Covenant. The Assembly may consider it on its own initiative, under Article 19. That something of the kind is bound to happen seems assured by the determination already shown by the League officials, as well as by the many outside protests raised against the failure of France and Belgium to act promptly and in full accordance with the letter of Article 18. When the matter comes up for consideration, whether it be in the Assembly, as seems most likely, or in the Council, France and Belgium will have to consider not only Article 18, but also Article 20, which says that "the members of the League severally agree that this covenant is accepted as abrogating all obligations or understandings *inter se* which are inconsistent with the terms thereof, and solemnly undertake that they will not hereafter enter into any engagements inconsistent with the terms thereof."

Should the Assembly hold that France and Belgium have failed to live up to this article, or should a charge to that effect be made directly to the Council, this body will have to take the matter under consideration, in accordance with Article 16, the final clause of which says that "any member of the League which has violated any covenant of the League may be declared to be no longer a member of the League by a vote of the Council concurred in by the representatives of all the other members of the League represented thereon." In other words, France and Belgium may be forced to choose between the League and the continued privacy of their "military understanding." When that moment arrives they will not be helped by their representation on the Council, as their votes will be eliminated from any decision concerning an alleged delinquency of their own.

To me the whole situation seems distinctly hopeful, and I cannot help thinking it rather beneficial to the League's future development that the validity and proper interpretation of Article 18 have been brought under open discussion right at the start, under circumstances tending to make the whole civilized world interested in the final outcome. The one thing to be regretted in this connection is the absence of the United States from the League, and more especially from the Council, whereby the decision of the latter body in a case like the present may be rendered a little more uncertain than it would be otherwise.

You refer also to the formation of "The Little Entente" as another embarrassment. Again the facts of the case seem to me hardly to warrant your conclusion. The agreement between Czechoslovakia, Jugo-Slavia, and Rumania was submitted to the League before it was ratified by the contracting powers. It is now being studied by the League's

expert advisers, and should anything in the agreement be found incompatible with the spirit of the covenant, changes will be recommended, and these changes will undoubtedly be accepted by the three nations involved. The whole procedure constitutes one of the most striking recognitions of the League's authority so far recorded, and as such it ought to cheer and encourage every believer in the League of Nations as a means to obtain universal peace.

EDWIN BJÖRKMAN.

NEW YORK CITY, December 7, 1920.

BOOK REVIEWS

ARGENTINE OF TODAY. Edited by *William Belmont Parker*. The Hispanic Society of America, New York City. Two volumes.

This "Who Is Who" of the most wealthy and populous of the Spanish-speaking republics contains biographies (and in many cases portraits) of 420 persons pre-eminent in the various vocations that give dignity and worth to society. The editor is a Harvard graduate, a trained expert in publicity, and a successful projector of enterprises, cultural and commercial. He has done his work in Buenos Aires, where he has had the National Library and the Library of Congress to fall back upon, as well as the aid of some of the most eminent journalists and publicists of the city. These are creditable volumes of a *vade mecum* series the value of which to foreign commentators on Argentine affairs can hardly be overestimated. Cuba, Chile, Bolivia, and Peru have previously been dealt with in the same way by the same editor, working under the same generous patron, the Hispanic Society. When completed, the series will be a creditable memorial of North American and South American co-operation in an effort to make ignorance give way to knowledge.

AND THE KAISER ABDICATES. By *S. Miles Bouton*. Yale University Press, New Haven. Pp. 271. \$2.50.

This is the serious comment of a former Associated Press representative in Berlin, who was in that city and in Vienna during the first months of the war; who was with the German army on all fronts during 1914-16, and who later went to Stockholm and Copenhagen in the service of the Department of State. He watched the changes in Germany during the period between the downfall of the Kaiser and the signing of the armistice and went into Berlin as soon as the armistice was signed. He studied the "Spartacan" uprising and the first struggles of the "German Republic" to stabilize conditions. Such value as the book may have inheres in its cold facts and not in its colorful style. It is difficult to believe that a man could see so much and describe it in such an unimpassioned fashion. Romanticists will call the book dull. Realists may rate it high for its very objectivity. When the author looks forward he is scarcely less dispassionate. It is a proletarian, radical, altered world he visualizes, with Germany unalterably changed from her monarchy and militarist rule; but whether it is to be a "red" or "white" form of internationalism and proletarian rule, he does not prophesy. He does not hesitate to say that the Versailles Treaty has "Balkanized Europe" and has revived smoldering race antagonisms, created dozens of new irredeemables, and placed tens of thousands of persons under foreign yokes and tried to insure the permanency of their subjection. Consequently, internationalism is on the march among intellectuals as well as among wage-earners of all countries of Europe.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH. By *Zechariah Chafee, Jr.* Harcourt, Brace & Howe. New York City. Pp. 431, with bibliography, appendices, and list of court cases. \$2.50.

From the Harvard University Law School, with Dean Roscoe Pound as its head, there has come much progressive and even radical thinking during the first two decades of the century, thought-fostered by a faculty of which the author of this book is a member. In the controversy, induced by the recent war, over the legitimacy and wisdom of executive,

legislative, and judicial pronouncements and acts, Professor Chafee has been conspicuous, and notably in his co-operation with other eminent lawyers and teachers of law, in protest against policies of the Department of Justice under the rule of the present head of the same, Hon. A. Mitchell Palmer.

Professor Chafee expressly disclaims atheism, anarchism, pacificism, socialism, or communism as essentials of his personal creed. He has no sympathy with the views of most of the men who have been imprisoned since the war began for candid expression of their beliefs. His interest in the problem, which he has discussed with erudition, much amassing of evidence and rare good sense in this book, is partly professional, partly personal—as a conservative who wants to be left with some degree of freedom and some rights when radicalism comes into power—and also humanistic. He is concerned with aiding in definition of the precise limits of free speech rather than in defending it as an unlimited right. He never doubts that there is a point which when once passed by the individual, then society, acting through the government, must interfere.

Intent on informing his countrymen as to just what has been done during and since the war and preferring to discuss his thesis in terms of the concrete, Professor Chafee has plunged promptly into the fray, but not before he has dealt with the large topic of "freedom of speech in war time." And his conclusion is that both Congress and the Supreme Court must ever remember that social welfare and love of truth have to be given an equal chance. Both interests must be guarded and kept unimpaired, and "the great interest in free speech should be sacrificed only when the interest in public safety is really imperiled, and not, as most men believe, when it is barely conceivable that it may be slightly affected." He puts the boundary line "close to the point where words will give rise to unlawful acts." Nor will most congressmen, senators, attorneys general, and judges differ. Indeed, he claims that the wisest judicial comment of the period is that of Judge Learned Hand, of the United States District Court, New York City, to whom the book is dedicated; and Judge Hand has persistently taken this position.

There is no book like this work in its range of data and comment and variety of approach to the fundamental principles involved not only in free speech, but in an open, free immigration policy and an aggressive deportation of aliens program. The cases of the Socialists of New York's Assembly and of Victor Berger, the Wisconsin congressman, are analyzed. A suggestive chapter has to do with freedom of thought and speech in educational institutions, and everything possible has been made to give the book contemporaneous value.

THE MORALS OF ECONOMIC INTERNATIONALISM. By *J. A. Hobson*. Houghton-Mifflin Co., Boston. Pp. 69. \$1.00.

This brief volume includes lectures given at the University of California when the eminent English author was last in the country. The lectures were given on a foundation established to discuss the "Morals of Trade"—a fact in itself somewhat significant. Mr. Hobson charges that the standard of international morality is lower than that of corporate (business) conduct, which in turn is lower than personal morality. Especially is this international immorality noticeable in matters of commercial intercourse.

He is of the opinion that "if the interests of consumers and the interests of producers weighed equally in the eyes of governments, as they should, the strongest of all obstacles to a peaceful, harmonious society of nations would be overcome; for the suspicions, jealousies, and hostilities of nations," he says, "are inspired more by the tendencies of groups of producers to misrepresent their private interests as the good of their respective countries than by any other single circumstance."

Mr. Hobson is convinced that the two primary duties of the civilized nations today are, first, immediate salvage and restoration of Europe, and, second, preparation for permanent co-operation or agreement as to "equitable use of the economic resources of the world." In the work of salvage he includes not only giving alms to the foodless and clothless, but the maintenance of credit of nations too weak other-